

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 and 23-27 were presented for examination in the present application. The instant amendment cancels claims 24-27 and adds new claims 28-31. Thus, claims 1-20, 23, and 28-31 are pending upon entry of the instant amendment. Claims 1, 10, and 28 are independent.

Claims 24-27 have been cancelled without prejudice, rendering moot the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 and under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0053454 to Katsavounidis et al. (Katsavounidis). Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under §§101 and 103 to claims 24-27 are respectfully requested.

Claims 28-31 have been added to point out various aspects of the present application. Support for claims 28-31 can be found in the specification at least at page 7, line 29 through page 9, line 27. No new matter is added.

Claims 28-31 are not intended to be limited to the specific mechanisms of patentability previously argued with respect to any prior claims in this or any related applications. Accordingly, Applicant hereby rescinds any disclaimer of claim scope and, thus, any prior art for which such a disclaimer was made to avoid may need to be revisited by the Examiner with respect to claims 28-31.

Claims 28-31 are believed to be in condition for allowance. For example, claim 28 recites, in part, the steps of "calculating, at the sending side via a processor, a **single cyclic redundancy check code for the block of user specific data and the block of check data**" and generating "a second data packet **consisting essentially of the single cyclic redundancy check code**".

Applicant respectfully submits that Katsavounidis, alone or combination with Dold, fails to disclose or suggest the cyclic redundancy check code calculating step required by claim 28.

Katsavounidis discloses a system that efficiently and selectively applies forward error correction (FEC) coding. Specifically, Katsavounidis discloses that the FEC coding is applied only to important data, such as motion vectors, DC coefficients and header information, rather than generating FEC bits for unimportant or less important data. Here, for a given frame or VOP, the selected packet bits targeted for FEC coding are concatenated together and the FEC code bits are generated for the concatenated bits. See paragraph [0016].

Applicant respectfully submits that Katsavounidis fails to disclose or suggest that the FEC coding is applied to a block of user specific data and to a block of check data as required by claim 28.

In fact, Katsavounidis fails to disclose or suggest that the FEC coding includes check data at all for the FEC bits to be generated from.

Rather, the selective application of the FEC coding of Katsavounidis teaches away from the calculating step of claim 28, which requires the block of check data to be included in cyclic redundancy check code calculating step, whereas Katsavounidis only teaches generating the FEC code bits for the concatenated bits of "important data".

Dold is merely asserted by the Office Action as disclosing that Interbus is interchangeable with bus protocols such as CAN, Profibus, Ethernet, ASI, DeviceNet or CANopen. However, Dold clearly fails to cure the aforementioned and other deficiencies of Katsavounidis.

Accordingly, claim 28, as well as claims 29-31 that depend therefrom, are not disclosed or suggested by the cited art and are therefore in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 1 and 10, as well as dependent claims 2-9 and 11-20, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Katsavounidis. Dependent claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Katsavounidis in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0200323 to Dold et al. (Dold).

Claim 1 recites that the redundant information is "based solely on all the security-relevant data of the first data packet".

Stated another way, claim 1 requires that for each packet containing the security-relevant data (i.e., the first packet), there is a second packet that contains the redundant information, where this redundant information is based solely on all the security-relevant data of the first data packet.

Again, Katsavounidis discloses at least in paragraph [0016] a system that efficiently and selectively applies forward error correction (FEC) coding, where the FEC coding is applied only to important data. Importantly, the FEC code bits are generated for the concatenated bits of the important data.

Thus, to the extent that "concatenated selected portions" of Katsavounidis can be read as the "redundant information" of claim 1, it is clear that Katsavounidis discloses that these concatenated selected portions correspond only the important information and, thus teaches away from the "redundant information" recited by claim 1 that is "based solely on all the security-relevant data of the first data packet".

Accordingly, user data and redundancy data of claim 1 provide two packets of a security-oriented message that are arranged in a new and non-obvious way. Thus, the

process of claim 1 does not require any additional data packets or redundancy information to be added.

The Advisory Action failed to address these distinctions argued previously with respect to claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2-9 that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-9 are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 10 now recites "means, arranged on the side of the sender, for the packet-oriented embedding of the security-relevant data into the first data packet and for the packet-oriented embedding of each **allocated redundant information, based solely on all the security-relevant data of the first data packet**, into the allocated second data packet of the security-oriented message (emphasis added)".

As discussed in detail above, Katsavounidis merely discloses concatenating **selected or important portions** of packet data corresponding to a plurality of frame packets for a first frame. See paragraphs [0016] and [0017]. As such, and to the extent that "concatenated selected portions" of Katsavounidis can be read as the "allocated redundant information" of claim 10, it is clear that Katsavounidis teaches away from the "allocated redundant information" recited by claim 10 that is "based solely on **all the security-relevant data of the first data packet**".

Thus, claim 10 also requires that the redundant information is based solely on all of the security-relevant information, whereas Katsavounidis discloses that each packet having FEC codes is for an amount of selected information.

Additionally, user data and redundancy data of claim 10 provide two packets of a security-oriented message that are arranged in a new and non-obvious way that do not require any additional data or redundancy information to be added, which is not disclosed or suggested by the additional FEC bits added by Katsavounidis.

The Office Action fails to assert that Dold to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Katsavounidis.

The Advisory Action also failed to address these distinctions argued previously with respect to claim 10.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10, as well as claims 11-20 that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance over the cited art alone or in combination. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claims 11-20 are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Such action is solicited. If for any reason the Examiner feels that consultation with Applicant's attorney would be helpful in the advancement of the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

January 26, 2011

/Edward L. McMahon/
Edward L. McMahon
Reg. No. 44,927
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: (203) 327-4500
Fax: (203) 327-6401